

the pious cant of Governments, to have most to do with the great concerns of the nation, far less with them than it has now, when the knowledge of the ecclesiasticalism of the Government, the clergy of the nation, who are constrained to look more to the moral character of his acts, than to the devotion of his expressions. Now, through church organizations, through the force of "ecclesiasticalism," so much as through the moral sentiment of the people, does the influence of the clergy of the nation, the Christianity of the People is something higher and more potent than ecclesiasticalism or ecclesiastical organizations.

STATE OF THINGS IN CONGRESS.

With a large Democratic majority in each House of Congress, the Administration can expect of little effective support. In the case of Commodore Paulding, it would have scarcely been sustained but for the co-operation of the Republicans. Its policy in relation to a permanent increase of the army voted down in the Senate, and last week was voted down in the House, Mr. Fairbanks' amendments, and the views of the House, and the majority of forty-seven out of two hundred and thirty-four votes. Its great measure, the admission of Kansas under the Leocompton Constitution, struggles against an opposition for which it was unprepared. Four months have gone by, and the measure is still in the air, and last Tuesday, for the first time, the Senate began to vote upon the question.

The debate on the subject has been marked by great ability and spirit, especially on the part of the Opposition, who have rested their case on Justice and the fundamental Principles of Free Government. For many of the ablest Senators have relied chiefly upon technicalities and special pleading. The efforts that attracted most attention last week were those of Mr. Crittenden of Kentucky and Mr. Bell of Tennessee. Southern men, long treated and honored by their section, they gave noble aid to the cause of the Union, and in the great inquiry, their denunciation of the Leocompton and Opposition to which the People of Kansas have been subjected was eloquent and unqualified, and they declared their uncompromising opposition to the recognition of the Leocompton Constitution, and their refusal to be bound by any honorable modification of any section. Mr. Tombs deplored the position of Mr. Crittenden, and said that for himself he considered the Union a myth, and he had already calculated its value. Mr. Bell rebuked indignantly his Southern sentiments, and admonished him that the Union was not prepared to make an issue of Union or disunion upon this question. The spectacle of Mr. Crittenden, with the denunciations of Wise, Walker, and Stanton, all leading Southern men, who that opposition to the Leocompton Constitution is far from being sectional. The speaker is, that the Union is not prepared to look upon it without hesitation. How can Southern men, with a spark of chivalric sentiment, here to take advantage of such a series of frauds as have engendered that Constitution?

In the House, on every preliminary motion affecting the measure, the Administration has failed—first, in the appointment of select committees of fifteen to investigate the transactions attending the formation of the Constitution; then, on the attempt of the majority of the committee (which had been constituted by the Speaker so as to thwart the will of the House) to have the measure referred to the committee on the table; then on the motion to lay on the table the appeal of Mr. Harris from the decision of the Speaker on a question of privilege; and finally on the motion of Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, to refer to the Committee on Territories the introduction of the Leocompton Constitution by Mr. Montgomery. In all these cases, the Administration has defeated itself, in no instance has it shown itself in a majority. Even in the Senate, when it attempted by an act of blind despotism to "crash out" the minority, and abridge the right of discussion, it only succeeded in making the measure more unpopular, and it was compelled to retreat, and accept the terms of conferring and closing the debate previously offered by the Republican Senators.

No wonder that the Opposition in the House should become firm and more confident every day. It is composed of Republicans, Douglas men, and a few Southern men, and numbers, it is claimed, one majority in a full House. The one point of sympathy between them, is hostility to the recognition of the Leocompton Constitution. Will they continue to co-operate in this case, all will have overthrown the Administration. Will they forget or postpone their controversies on other questions? They must do so, or this foul measure will pass. The Republicans oppose it, because it is the creature of fraud and oppression—because it is a violation of the right of self-government—because it has been conceived and urged as a private measure. Democracy opposes it, chiefly for the first two reasons. Southern Americans oppose it, because it is a fraud and an oppression, and, while disowning the South, will add neither to its wealth nor power. If they continue to co-operate, the Leocompton Constitution cannot be recognized. Do they?

John Calhoun has issued a card in the Washington Star, announcing that, having been satisfied of the fraud practiced at the Delaware Crossing, certificates of election will be given to the Free State candidates, thus securing the Legislature to the Free State Party, and giving Mr. Douglas a majority in the Senate, which he has not.

Is this in relation to the Free State officers—to the Governor, who will have a veto on the acts of the Legislature? But, suppose the election of the entire Free State Legislature be declared, will that cure the fraud which gave birth to the Constitution, or harmonize it with the People's Sovereignty or the right of self-government? Will that justify him in forcing upon an unwilling People a Constitution which they have already voted down?

As to Southern Americans, they fear that their position may subject them to misrepresentation. They are in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

infatuation which could drive them to support an Administration to which they are hostile, in its efforts to pass a measure, which they do not believe in, and which is based on fraud, looking to the admission of a State which it is conceded, must be free, and has already, according to the manifesto of John Calhoun, a Free State Legislature.

THE STATE LEGISLATURE OF KANSAS.

The Star of last evening contains the subjoined communication from General Calhoun, the President of the late State Convention in Kansas, announcing the result of the election of the 4th of January, and the 22d of December. It seems to consider Mr. Calhoun very essentially damaged by it, remarking as follows:

"I find, the official character of the report, and the testimony which it purports to adduce, renders it impossible for Mr. Calhoun to avoid the charge of fraud, and of having been guilty of falsifying the returns of election. It is due to his position, and the grave duties which he has assumed, that he should vindicate his conduct in this matter."

This language in a Southern Administration paper, of the standing of the *Enquirer*, is significant.

A month ago I was in possession of a newspaper containing what purported to be the address of the judges of election in Kansas, and, in a communication to the *Union*, I immediately stated that if the facts contained therein were true, the number of votes in an authentic and reliable form, I should be obliged to them in determining the result of the election.

"Although I have not received any reply to my letter to Gov. Denver, yet, from various sources of information, I am left in no doubt as to the truth of the facts, and, in consequence of that, I shall, therefore, issue the certificates of election to the persons having the largest number of votes in the State, irrespective of the 'Delaware Crossing' pretence."

I regret to find that this decision will give the control of Kansas to a party which I view as the enemy of the peace and good order of the State, and of the Union.

To the following persons, elected in the several Senatorial and Representative districts in Kansas, certificates of election will accordingly be issued:

He then proceeds to name the persons to whom certificates will be given.

It will be observed that nothing is said in relation to the election of the officers of the new State. It is only the names of the whole rank of members of the Legislature, and, as we have decided, as to put the Executive or Administrative power into the hands of the Pro-Slavery faction.

Another thing—be announced in a former communication that he should postpone a decision on the subject of the Leocompton Constitution, and that he should not be bound by any honorable modification of any section. Mr. Tombs deplored the position of Mr. Crittenden, and said that for himself he considered the Union a myth, and he had already calculated its value. Mr. Bell rebuked indignantly his Southern sentiments, and admonished him that the Union was not prepared to make an issue of Union or disunion upon this question. The spectacle of Mr. Crittenden, with the denunciations of Wise, Walker, and Stanton, all leading Southern men, who that opposition to the Leocompton Constitution is far from being sectional. The speaker is, that the Union is not prepared to look upon it without hesitation. How can Southern men, with a spark of chivalric sentiment, here to take advantage of such a series of frauds as have engendered that Constitution?

In the House, on every preliminary motion affecting the measure, the Administration has failed—first, in the appointment of select committees of fifteen to investigate the transactions attending the formation of the Constitution; then, on the attempt of the majority of the committee (which had been constituted by the Speaker so as to thwart the will of the House) to have the measure referred to the committee on the table; then on the motion to lay on the table the appeal of Mr. Harris from the decision of the Speaker on a question of privilege; and finally on the motion of Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, to refer to the Committee on Territories the introduction of the Leocompton Constitution by Mr. Montgomery. In all these cases, the Administration has defeated itself, in no instance has it shown itself in a majority. Even in the Senate, when it attempted by an act of blind despotism to "crash out" the minority, and abridge the right of discussion, it only succeeded in making the measure more unpopular, and it was compelled to retreat, and accept the terms of conferring and closing the debate previously offered by the Republican Senators.

No wonder that the Opposition in the House should become firm and more confident every day. It is composed of Republicans, Douglas men, and a few Southern men, and numbers, it is claimed, one majority in a full House. The one point of sympathy between them, is hostility to the recognition of the Leocompton Constitution. Will they continue to co-operate in this case, all will have overthrown the Administration. Will they forget or postpone their controversies on other questions? They must do so, or this foul measure will pass. The Republicans oppose it, because it is the creature of fraud and oppression—because it is a violation of the right of self-government—because it has been conceived and urged as a private measure. Democracy opposes it, chiefly for the first two reasons. Southern Americans oppose it, because it is a fraud and an oppression, and, while disowning the South, will add neither to its wealth nor power. If they continue to co-operate, the Leocompton Constitution cannot be recognized. Do they?

John Calhoun has issued a card in the Washington Star, announcing that, having been satisfied of the fraud practiced at the Delaware Crossing, certificates of election will be given to the Free State candidates, thus securing the Legislature to the Free State Party, and giving Mr. Douglas a majority in the Senate, which he has not.

Is this in relation to the Free State officers—to the Governor, who will have a veto on the acts of the Legislature? But, suppose the election of the entire Free State Legislature be declared, will that cure the fraud which gave birth to the Constitution, or harmonize it with the People's Sovereignty or the right of self-government? Will that justify him in forcing upon an unwilling People a Constitution which they have already voted down?

As to Southern Americans, they fear that their position may subject them to misrepresentation. They are in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

struggle, and of damage, in any event, to the Administration, the Democratic party, and the harmony of the Union?"

The correspondence of Colonel Rogers' *Free Press*, in its issue of the 22d of December, contains an account of the speech of Mr. Calhoun, in which he is said to have said that he would not be bound by any honorable modification of any section. Mr. Tombs deplored the position of Mr. Crittenden, and said that for himself he considered the Union a myth, and he had already calculated its value. Mr. Bell rebuked indignantly his Southern sentiments, and admonished him that the Union was not prepared to make an issue of Union or disunion upon this question. The spectacle of Mr. Crittenden, with the denunciations of Wise, Walker, and Stanton, all leading Southern men, who that opposition to the Leocompton Constitution is far from being sectional. The speaker is, that the Union is not prepared to look upon it without hesitation. How can Southern men, with a spark of chivalric sentiment, here to take advantage of such a series of frauds as have engendered that Constitution?

The Star of last evening contains the subjoined communication from General Calhoun, the President of the late State Convention in Kansas, announcing the result of the election of the 4th of January, and the 22d of December. It seems to consider Mr. Calhoun very essentially damaged by it, remarking as follows:

"I find, the official character of the report, and the testimony which it purports to adduce, renders it impossible for Mr. Calhoun to avoid the charge of fraud, and of having been guilty of falsifying the returns of election. It is due to his position, and the grave duties which he has assumed, that he should vindicate his conduct in this matter."

This language in a Southern Administration paper, of the standing of the *Enquirer*, is significant.

A month ago I was in possession of a newspaper containing what purported to be the address of the judges of election in Kansas, and, in a communication to the *Union*, I immediately stated that if the facts contained therein were true, the number of votes in an authentic and reliable form, I should be obliged to them in determining the result of the election.

"Although I have not received any reply to my letter to Gov. Denver, yet, from various sources of information, I am left in no doubt as to the truth of the facts, and, in consequence of that, I shall, therefore, issue the certificates of election to the persons having the largest number of votes in the State, irrespective of the 'Delaware Crossing' pretence."

I regret to find that this decision will give the control of Kansas to a party which I view as the enemy of the peace and good order of the State, and of the Union.

To the following persons, elected in the several Senatorial and Representative districts in Kansas, certificates of election will accordingly be issued:

He then proceeds to name the persons to whom certificates will be given.

It will be observed that nothing is said in relation to the election of the officers of the new State. It is only the names of the whole rank of members of the Legislature, and, as we have decided, as to put the Executive or Administrative power into the hands of the Pro-Slavery faction.

Another thing—be announced in a former communication that he should postpone a decision on the subject of the Leocompton Constitution, and that he should not be bound by any honorable modification of any section. Mr. Tombs deplored the position of Mr. Crittenden, and said that for himself he considered the Union a myth, and he had already calculated its value. Mr. Bell rebuked indignantly his Southern sentiments, and admonished him that the Union was not prepared to make an issue of Union or disunion upon this question. The spectacle of Mr. Crittenden, with the denunciations of Wise, Walker, and Stanton, all leading Southern men, who that opposition to the Leocompton Constitution is far from being sectional. The speaker is, that the Union is not prepared to look upon it without hesitation. How can Southern men, with a spark of chivalric sentiment, here to take advantage of such a series of frauds as have engendered that Constitution?

In the House, on every preliminary motion affecting the measure, the Administration has failed—first, in the appointment of select committees of fifteen to investigate the transactions attending the formation of the Constitution; then, on the attempt of the majority of the committee (which had been constituted by the Speaker so as to thwart the will of the House) to have the measure referred to the committee on the table; then on the motion to lay on the table the appeal of Mr. Harris from the decision of the Speaker on a question of privilege; and finally on the motion of Mr. Stephens, of Georgia, to refer to the Committee on Territories the introduction of the Leocompton Constitution by Mr. Montgomery. In all these cases, the Administration has defeated itself, in no instance has it shown itself in a majority. Even in the Senate, when it attempted by an act of blind despotism to "crash out" the minority, and abridge the right of discussion, it only succeeded in making the measure more unpopular, and it was compelled to retreat, and accept the terms of conferring and closing the debate previously offered by the Republican Senators.

No wonder that the Opposition in the House should become firm and more confident every day. It is composed of Republicans, Douglas men, and a few Southern men, and numbers, it is claimed, one majority in a full House. The one point of sympathy between them, is hostility to the recognition of the Leocompton Constitution. Will they continue to co-operate in this case, all will have overthrown the Administration. Will they forget or postpone their controversies on other questions? They must do so, or this foul measure will pass. The Republicans oppose it, because it is the creature of fraud and oppression—because it is a violation of the right of self-government—because it has been conceived and urged as a private measure. Democracy opposes it, chiefly for the first two reasons. Southern Americans oppose it, because it is a fraud and an oppression, and, while disowning the South, will add neither to its wealth nor power. If they continue to co-operate, the Leocompton Constitution cannot be recognized. Do they?

John Calhoun has issued a card in the Washington Star, announcing that, having been satisfied of the fraud practiced at the Delaware Crossing, certificates of election will be given to the Free State candidates, thus securing the Legislature to the Free State Party, and giving Mr. Douglas a majority in the Senate, which he has not.

Is this in relation to the Free State officers—to the Governor, who will have a veto on the acts of the Legislature? But, suppose the election of the entire Free State Legislature be declared, will that cure the fraud which gave birth to the Constitution, or harmonize it with the People's Sovereignty or the right of self-government? Will that justify him in forcing upon an unwilling People a Constitution which they have already voted down?

As to Southern Americans, they fear that their position may subject them to misrepresentation. They are in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

Why contumacious. Why contumacious? What have they to gain by using a measure adopted by James Buchanan in 1848? Is it in favor of Free Kansas? Southern Americans are in favor of the purity of the elective franchise; denunciations of fraud at the ballot-box. Where are the frauds to equal those of Oxford, Kickapoo, and Delaware Crossing? and will they sanction or suffer them, because Republicans detect them? Can sensible men really suppose that they act from so paltry a policy?

passing on to Hispania, relates the rebellion and subjugation of the Indians, and considers the subject of the *Buenavista*, which were royal grants to persons of the name of Buena Vista, and the only candidate whom the South can hope to elect to the office of President."

The President's conduct in pressing the Leocompton Constitution upon Congress was to give him the requisite strength in the North to secure a new election.

It is said that another great Anti-Leocompton meeting will soon be held in New York.

It has been formally announced to these meeting, that no important diplomatic appointments will be made till after the Kansas question shall have been settled. Judge Roosevelt is named in connection with the ministry to Madrid.

The Memphis (Tenn.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

assertion founded on the views of distinguished members of Congress; and it is sustained by the probability that Mr. Buchanan may be said to be the only Democratic leader and statesman who could secure in the contest a majority in the Senate, and the only candidate whom the South can hope to elect to the office of President."

The President's conduct in pressing the Leocompton Constitution upon Congress was to give him the requisite strength in the North to secure a new election.

It is said that another great Anti-Leocompton meeting will soon be held in New York.

It has been formally announced to these meeting, that no important diplomatic appointments will be made till after the Kansas question shall have been settled. Judge Roosevelt is named in connection with the ministry to Madrid.

The Memphis (Tenn.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va.) *Enquirer* is opposed to the Leocompton Constitution, unless it is submitted to the People of Kansas; but it is admitted to provide any provision attached to the Leocompton Constitution, which would not be a violation of the principles of the Constitution, which furnishes to the able Abolitionists of the North the very arguments for interference with our National Constitution which they are now using to prevent the Leocompton Constitution.

The Richmond (Va

